

State Commission on Juvenile Justice Meeting Minutes

March 27, 2008, 10:00am – 3:00pm
4241 Williamsborough Drive, Room 206
Sacramento, CA 95823

Commission Members in Attendance

Bernard Warner, Tri-chair
Penelope Clarke, Tri-chair
Don Meyer, Tri-chair
Javier Stauring
David Steinhart
Sheriff Gregory Ahern
Jim Salio
Dr. William Arroyo
Hubert Walsh
Kurt Kumli

Others in Attendance

Chris Murray
Eleanor Silva
Kim Bushard
Jermica Peters
Rosie Lamb
Carole D'Elia
Noor Dawood
Meghan Lary
Karen Johnson
Rosalinda Rosalez

The meeting was facilitated by Don Meyer, Tri-Chair.

Meeting Minutes of February 27, 2008

A motion was made to by Mr. Steinhart to approve the minutes from the February meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Clarke.

Mr. Meyer called for all those in favor of proposed motion. All members were in favor.

Commission Business

Roll was taken and Mr. Meyer stated that there was a quorum. There remains one outstanding appointment for a victim's advocate. New Members, Sheriff Ahern and Mr. Salio briefly introduced themselves and their work histories.

Summary of County Juvenile Justice Development Plans

Chris Murray, Christopher Murray and Associates

Chris had a medical emergency. Eleanor Silva presented the information in his absence:

- The total amount of funds distributed was \$22.7 million.
- Most Youthful Offender Block Grant funds went to the 14 largest counties.
- Funds were more evenly distributed on a per capita basis.
- 45% of the counties used funds to acquire and/or enhance assessment tools.

- 95% of the counties used funds to add and/or enhance programs and services.
- The most frequent program enhancement was probation services, particularly in the small counties.
- Mental health and substance abuse treatment was the next most frequent enhancements.
- 34% of counties used funds to contract for in-county and out-of-county beds and programs.
- 55% of the counties used funds to add probation staff.
- 21% of the counties used funds to add treatment staff.
- 45% of the counties used funds for staff training.
- 41% of the counties used funds to acquire equipment and/or supplies.
- Most of the counties used funds to develop new or enhance re-entry aftercare programs.
- 23% of the small counties used funds to develop new re-entry programs.

Examples of Other State Systems

Chris Murray, Christopher Murray and Associates

Chris shared a PowerPoint presentation with examples of systems from Ohio, Washington and Oregon.

Ohio

- RECLAIM – Reasoned and Equitable Community and Local Alternatives to the Incarceration of Minors
- RECLAIM Ohio is an incentive plan developed in 1993 to encourage juvenile courts to develop or contract for a range of community-based sanctions and treatment options.
- The program's goals are to empower local judges with sentencing options and disposition alternatives for juvenile offenders and to improve the ability of the Department of Youth Services (DYS) to treat and rehabilitate youthful offenders.
- Counties receive a monthly allocation from DHS based on the number of youth adjudicated for felonies in the previous four years.
- Funds may be used for any juvenile justice purpose except construction, renovation, or supplanting local funds.
- In 2006, more than 50,000 youth participated in local RECLAIM programs.

Washington

- CJAA – Community Juvenile Accountability Act
- The Community Juvenile Accountability Act was passed in 1997 and provides state funding for local juvenile courts to implement intervention programs.
- The goal of the Act is to cost effectively reduce juvenile crime.
- All juvenile courts in Washington State use the same risk/needs assessment tool and have implemented one or more CJAA programs.
- A similar initiative, Reinvesting in Youth, received state funding in 2006.

Oregon

- JCPP – Juvenile Crime Prevention Program
- The Juvenile Crime Prevention Program grants provide state funds to counties for programs aimed at preventing high-risk youth from committing or repeating crimes.
- Funds are based on each county's youth population age 18 or younger.
- The purpose is to prevent criminal behavior by: using a research-based assessment tool to identify youth with risk factors as early as possible, targeting high-risk pre-delinquent and delinquent youth, reducing risk factors and increasing protective factors related to juvenile crime, and utilizing proven strategies and best practices.
- Grants are used for delinquent or pre-delinquent youth who have two or more of the identified risk factors.

- High-level outcome measures have shown generally positive trends since implementation of the JCPP in 1999.

Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan Draft Outline and Work Plan

Chris Murray, Chris Murray and Associates

Chris reviewed a draft outline and draft Work Plan which provided recommended content for the Work Plan. The group entered discussion and provided Mr. Murray with comments and suggestions regarding the audience, format, and focus of the Work Plan.

The role of the commission was discussed. Chris suggested that the Commission give some thought to discussing further in depth the following topics:

- goals and guiding principles
- how to present the juvenile justice continuum
- risk and needs assessment tools
- evidence based programs
- data systems

Stakeholder Involvement

To initiate stakeholder involvement it was proposed that the Commission conduct a few focus groups and include non-represented entities. A discussion ensued about how, when and where to conduct focus groups. Two proposals were made as to how to conduct the focus groups:

- Have a small discussion forum
- Send material to stakeholder groups via email and ask for feedback

Closing Remarks

All Commission members agreed to hold the next meeting on April 24, 2008, at the Division of Juvenile Justice Headquarters, Room 206, in Sacramento. The facilitator of the next meeting will be Tri-chair, Bernard Warner. Suggested topics for the next meeting include a discussion on the status report due May 1, 2008, and the content of the Juvenile Delinquency Court statewide assessment by the Administrative Office of the Courts, a discussion on goals and guiding principles, build a picture of the continuum, risk and needs assessment tools, outcome measures, common data elements, strategies for implementing evidence based programs, and security needs.